



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/646,958

08/21/2003

Carey W. Smith

42P16159

3005

8791

7590

07/11/2008

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP  
1279 OAKMEAD PARKWAY  
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085-4040

EXAMINER

CHO, HONG SOL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2619

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/11/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/646,958	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SMITH, CAREY W.	
	<b>Examiner</b> HONG CHO	<b>Art Unit</b> 2619	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6-8,13-15 and 20-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 6-8, 13-15 and 20-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This office action is in response to the amendment filed on 05/27/2008. Claims 2-5, 9-12 and 16-19 were canceled. Claims 1, 6-8, 13-15 and 20-25 are present in the instant application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 1, 6-8, 13-15 and 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Araujo et al (US 6108350), hereinafter referred to as Araujo, in view of Milbrandt (US 6631120) and further in view of Oshins et al (US 6108350), hereinafter referred to as Oshins.

Re claims 1, 8, 15, 22 and 25, Araujo discloses a central office (*a second node*, figure 1a, element 130) negotiating with customer premises equipment (CPE) including an ADSL modem (*a first node*, figure 1, element 110) to use a cell-based protocol

*(determining one or more communication protocols via which a second node is capable of communicating with the first node based upon one or more parameters received from the second node during an initialization of communication between the first node and the second node, column 5, lines 30-40).* Araujo discloses implementing cell-based protocol (ATM protocol) stack after negotiating between the customer premises equipment and the central office such that the cell-based protocol is used on the link *(selecting second drivers to implement a second communication protocol if the one or more parameters specify the second communication protocol, column 5, lines 50-53).* Araujo fails to disclose selecting first drivers to implement an Ethernet protocol if the one or more parameters specify the first communication protocol. Milbrandt discloses a communication device supporting an Ethernet protocol (column 5, line 3). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Araujo by adding to it Ethernet protocol stack as suggested by Milbrandt for the benefit of conforming to widely used data link layer protocol, Ethernet. Araujo and Milbrandt fail to disclose invoking a plug and play (PnP) protocol manager to initiate loading of the one or more drivers into memory. Oshins discloses a PnP manager to load a device driver into memory (column 6, lines 50-52). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Araujo with the teaching of Oshins for the benefit of loading of appropriate drivers by the PnP manager determining which drivers are required to support a particular functional unit and the loading of those drivers.

Re claims 6, 13 and 20, Araujo discloses customer premises equipment with an ADSL modem driver to be utilized for selection protocol stack (*the first node comprises at least one modem driver and the determining is performed, at least in part, by the at least one modem driver*, figure 1a, element 118).

Re claims 7, 14 and 21, Araujo discloses a central office negotiating with customer premises equipment to use a cell-based protocol (*initialization of the communication comprises a negotiation between the first node and the second node; and in response at least in part to a request from the first node, the second node transmits during the negotiation the at least one parameter to the first node*, column 5, lines 30-40).

Re claims 22- 24, Araujo discloses the CPE (*the first node*) including a personal computer (PC) with a circuit board that includes a circuit card slot that is coupling a circuit card to the circuit board which is required to use one of protocol stacks (column 5, lines 44-51). Araujo implicitly discloses a PC with a circuit board comprising a bus and a host processor coupled to the bus; and when the circuit card with a DSL modem is coupled to the slot, the circuitry is coupled to the bus.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 5/27/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 9 of the Remarks, the applicant argues that nowhere in Araujo, Milbrandt and Oshins each fail to disclose or suggest a process of a PnP protocol manager loading into memory a first driver to implement an Ethernet protocol or a second driver to implement an Asynchronous Transfer Mode protocol. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Araujo discloses implementing ATM protocol stack, Milbrandt discloses implementing Ethernet protocol stack and Oshins discloses utilizing a PnP protocol to load drivers into memory. In this case, it is the combined teaching of Araujo, Milbrandt and Oshins that meets all claim limitations.

The applicant further argues that neither Araujo nor Milbrandt discloses a concept of using software drivers to implement particular protocols. In reply, it is required to use software drivers to implement an Ethernet protocol or ATM protocol stack in Araujo and Milbrandt since a program or protocol stack requires a software driver to initiate execution of the program or protocol stack.

On page 10 of the Remarks, the applicant argues neither Araujo, Milbrandt nor Oskins disclose or suggest a circuit board that includes a circuit card slot that is capable of coupling a circuit card to a circuit board. In reply, Araujo discloses the CPE (*the first node*) including a personal computer (PC) necessarily with a circuit board that includes a circuit card slot that is coupling a circuit card to the circuit board which is required to use one of protocol stacks (column 5, lines 44-51).

Therefore, the Examiner concludes that the rejection of claims stands.

***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hong Cho whose telephone number is 571-272-3087. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri during 7 am to 4 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing Chan can be reached on 571-272-7493. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Hong Cho/

Hong Cho  
Patent Examiner  
6/26/2008